A LETTER

To the AUTHOR of the REPLY to a late PAPER CALLED *A full Answer to Dr. Tenison's Conferences concerning the* EUCHARIST.

SIR,

I Am so great a Friend to Truth, that I cannot sufficiently express the favor you have done me in opening my mistake; yet give me leave so far to justifie my self, as to assure you, the same grounds which drew my Friend and me into the Error, has deceived many even of the Doctor's Admirers; and for my part I think it no disgrace to be mistaken in so good Company, and upon so good grounds too; for I always thought that the common practice of *Publishers* was, either to let the world know the Author's Name, or at least to disown themselves the Work; but not reading this piece of ingenuity in the front of the English Conferences, my Friend and I miss'd our way. However, if my Friend and I *must guess again*, you must write again; for I am sure you are not less over-seen in thinking my Paper answered, than We in imagining the Doctor to be the Author of the Conferences. This I will demonstrate in the first place, and then perchance, *ex abundanti*, I will touch some things in your Paper, neither spoken to the purpose, nor proved with reason.

The Author of the *Six Conferences* puts the ſtreſs of his whole Diſcourſe on this Principle, *That if Tranſubſtantiation were one of the Doctrins of Chriſtianity, Chriſtian Religion would be oppoſed with greater ſtrength than it can be maintained, becauſe one might oppoſe againſt it whatever is offered againſt Tranſubſtantiation, viz.* all evidence of ſenſe. I retorted the Argument, ſaying, That the ſame *medium* would throw down all Authority of Scripture, becauſe before a Pagan can be convinced of the Truth of Scripture, he muſt confeſs that *Abraham*'s ſenſes were deceived, and by conſequence that it is poſſible for *his own* to be ſo. Now, according to the Author of the *Six Conferences*, a Heathen hath greater evidence of the *Infallibility of his Senſes*, than of the *Truth of the holy Scriptures*; therefore he hath a ſtronger Argument to retain him from aſſenting to them, than to move him to embrace them. Now, *Sir*, if you think to enervate my Diſcourſe with thoſe Arguments you are pleaſed to expoſe in Print, *your Reaſon* is as much deceived as *Abraham's Senſes*; and if you intend to convince Men of their ſolidity, you muſt imagin their capacities to be as ſhallow as your own.

You anſwer thus: *They that appeared to* Abraham *in the* 18th *of* Geneſis, *for ought can be proved, did for that time aſſume the real Bodies of men*; and then you back your Aſſertion with a killing Parentheſis, *It ſhould ſeem ſo by their eating.* Now, *Sir*, if I reply, *For ought can be proved they did not aſſume real Bodies*; have I not as good an end of the ſtaff as you? Nay, the Angel *Raphael* told *Tobias*, (I ſuppoſe you will deny not the Story, tho' according to you it be not Scripture) *he did not really eat, but ſeemed ſo to do.* Whence, in my opinion, it may very probably be concluded, he had no man's Body, but only in appearance, otherwiſe he might have eaten as really as *Tobias*. But becauſe you thought men would not much rely on this weak Anſwer, you go to another; telling us, 'there is no parity between the *deceptio viſus* of *Abraham*, and *ours* in the *Euchariſt*. But why, *Sir*? becauſe 'tis *certain that to the making of that Creature, which we call a Man, there goes ſomething more than what is viſible to the eye*, viz. *a human Soul*; *and whether* that *were there or no, or an Angel in the room of it, was more than* Abraham *cou'd certainly diſcern by his ſenſes: But there is not the ſame caſe in ſeeing of a piece of Bread, becauſe there is no ground to think there is any thing in a piece of Bread more than what is diſcernable by ſenſe.* But, *Sir*, in the firſt place, ſuppoſe I ſhould attack you with your own Argument, I do not ſee how you would defend your ſelf. I anſwer then, *For ought that can be proved* there is ſome-

ſomething elſe. Nay, *Sir*, you cannot but know that the moſt approved Philoſophers, before Chriſtianity, maintained that in mix'd Bodies there was a *forma regens*, as they termed it; and others at leaſt admitted Elementary Forms, not diſcernible by the ſenſes. And few rejected theſe Opinions, till *Des Cartes* raked out of the Aſhes of *Epicurus* and *Democritus*, his *Scholaſtic Nonſenſe*. Now, *Sir*, preſcinding from Chriſtianity, the greateſt part of Philoſophers ſtand for me. Is it not then a madneſs above expreſſion to pawn your Soul *Des Cartes*'s Opinion is true. (I aſſure you, *Sir*, (by the by) people who are ſo prodigal of their own Soul, ſhall never have the guiding of mine.) And now, *Sir*, that you ſtake your Soul on *Des Cartes*'s ſide, I prove thus: If Chriſt hath revealed the reality of his Corporal Preſence in the B. Sacrament, and you deny it chiefly upon *Des Cartes* Account; you ſtake your Soul on *Des Cartes*'s his ſide; but ſo it is: *Ergo*, I prove the *Minor*. You deny that Chriſt has revealed his Corporal Preſence, becauſe 'tis impoſſible he ſhould: This you prove, becauſe 'tis impoſſible all our ſenſes ſhould be deceived. When I tell you, *Abraham's were*; you deny it, becauſe to the *making up that Creature we call a Man, there goes ſomething more than what is viſible to the eye*; in Bread the caſe is otherwiſe, *becauſe there is no ground to think there is any thing in a piece of Bread, more than what is diſcernible to ſenſe*. Therefore your Salvation or Damnation depends chiefly on the Truth or Falſity of this Opinion. Therefore you lay your Soul on *Des Cartes*'s ſide.

And now, *dear Reader*, I appeal to you, Whether our *Anti-Tranſubſtantiators*, or *Anti-Realiſts*, have ſo much reaſon to boaſt of, to ridicule one of the moſt Sacred Articles of Chriſtian Belief? An Article as old as Chriſtianity it ſelf, preached by the Apoſtles, delivered by holy Doctors, ſealed with the Blood of Martyrs, and more than once confirmed by General Councils. Shall I call him a Chriſtian; nay a man, who gives greater credit to a doting *Des Cartes*, than to ſo many Divine Oracles? No, no; who thus abuſes Reaſon, deſerves a place among thoſe Creatures who have none.

To illuſtrate your Anſwer, (which is very obſcure) you bring forth a *Black Dog*. *Sir*, let me tell you ſeriouſly, one of your Communion has been highly ſcandaliz'd that you ſhould play the Buffoon in ſo Sacred a matter. And for my part, I am reſolv'd my Paper ſhall not be *black'd* with your *Cur*: yet I muſt inform the Reader, 'tis more than probable the *Black Dog* bears ſome ſimilitude with the *Author*; firſt, as to the *colour*; ſecondly, they *both ſnarl* and *bark* to no purpoſe.

Next you accuſe me for condemning the Author's Logic. *Sir*, I did, and your ſelf too for defending it. What ſay you to this way of arguing; *Some Doctors are Ignoramuſſes in Logic, therefore all are?* You will, without doubt, at leaſt after ſome hums, grant the Antecedent, and then deny the Conſequence. What then will you ſay to this; *Our ſenſes deceive us in this particular circumſtance of the Euchariſt, therefore they may deceive us in any thing elſe?* Pray, *Sir*, one reaſon, Why the Conſequence of the firſt Enthymema muſt be deny'd, and not of the laſt? and another if you pleaſe, Why theſe be not univerſal Inductions from particular Antecedents?

Sir, becauſe you deſire me to give you as good Scripture-proofs for *Tranſubſtantiation* as there is for the *Trinity*, and alſo to load the Doctrin of the *Trinity*, as delivered by Scripture, with as many Abſurdities as follow from *Tranſubſtantiation*: I ſhall comply with your firſt demand, and confeſs ingenuouſly I cannot with the ſecond, becauſe no Abſurdities follow from the One or the Other; and all thoſe ſeeming Abſurdities you lay on *Tranſubſtantiation*, do rather aim at the *Real Preſence*: and ſo I think it ſufficient here to give as good Scripture-proofs for Chriſt's Corporal Preſence. I ſay then, this paſſage, *This is my Body*, is as convincing, both for the *Real Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation* too, as any you can find for the *Trinity*; nor is there any Text in all the Scripture which oppoſes it. Now for the *Trinity* what place will you allege? *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt: I and my Father am one*: Or, in fine, *There are Three who bear record in Heaven, the Father, and the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe Three are One*, Ep. Jo. 5. 7. Now, *Sir*, an *Arian* will draw from Scripture ſtronger Arguments to oppugn theſe Texts, than you can for your life to enervate mine, *This is my Body*. And firſt, if an *Arian* tells you it does not follow the *Three* Perſons are *One*, becauſe the Apoſtles were commanded to baptize in the Name of them *All*; How will you diſprove him? If you ſay, Chriſt affirm'd *He* and his *Father* were *One*; he will run to the other place, *My Father is greater than I.* If again you ſend him to St. *John Ep.* 1. 5. he will tell you it proves nothing, becauſe the verſe following explicates the precedent, *ibid.* 8. *And there are Three that bear witneſs in Earth, the Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood; and theſe Three are One*: Now 'tis evident theſe Three are not One ſubſtantially; therefore, ſays an *Arian*, nor the former. I know in your Bible, to wave the difficulty, you tranſlate

ſlate, Καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν, *And theſe Three agree in One*; but with what Authority? But ſtill an *Arian* will puſh on further, we read in *John* 17. 21. where Chriſt pray'd, *That they All may be One, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee*; *that They alſo may be One in Us.* And again, *ibid.* 22. *That They may be One, even as We are One.* He will argue ſo; Chriſt is only *One* with his Father, as 'tis poſſible for the Diſciples to be *One*: But 'tis poſſible for the Diſciples to be *One* only in *Affection*, not in *Subſtance*; therefore Chriſt is only *One in Affection* with his Father, not in *Subſtance.* Shew me, if you can, out of Scripture as ſeeming evidences againſt the Doctrin of Catholics concerning this Sacrament. But this will *be a long while a doing*, and therefore I ſhall ſhew you that the Doctrin of the Trinity contradicts this Maxim, *Quæ conveniunt in uno tertio conveniunt inter ſe*, in the true ſenſe of it. This Principle aſſerts, That *when two things agree with a third, they agree with themſelves*; therefore in the Bleſſed Trinity, if *two things* which agree with a *third*, do not agree with *themſelves*, the Doctrin of the Trinity contradicts the Principle: But in the Trinity two things which agree with a *third*, do *not* agree with *themſelves*; therefore the Doctrin of the Trinity contradicts the fore-mention'd Maxim. I prove it thus: *The perſon of the Son is the ſame with the Divine Eſſence, as alſo the perſon of the Father is identified with the ſame Divine Eſſence*; *therefore they agree with a third: But the perſon of the Son is not the ſame with the perſon of the Father*; *therefore the two perſons which agree with a third, do not agree with themſelves.* Have I not perform'd my promiſe, *Sir?*

Your laſt quarrel againſt me is, That I have propoſed an inſufficient method to convert an underſtanding Infidel. But let us ſee from whence ariſes the grounds of inſufficiency? I will change my *Infidel* into a *Proteſtant Miniſter* for the preſent, and ask him, If he will admit there is a God? I ſuppoſe he will not deny it, out of a fear of paſſing for a *Papiſt.* I will proceed farther, and enquire, Whether God does not ſee ſome Truths, which never a Member of the Univerſity can conceive? He muſt grant it, or eat up his firſt Conceſſion, becauſe otherwiſe God would not be infinitly Wiſe, and by conſequence no God. *Thirdly*, I would demand, Whether God cannot reveal thoſe Truths, and command his Creatures to believe them? This alſo he muſt grant me, under pain of being one of thoſe Fools mentioned by *David*, *The Fool ſaid*

ſaid in his heart there is no God. In fine, I would ask this Miniſter, What evidence he required to be aſſured that God had revealed theſe Truths? If he be a rational Creature, he would anſwer me, Such a one as no prudent man could doubt of. Now, is not all moral evidence of this nature? Therefore, ſeeing there is all the moral evidence in the world that the Scripture is the Word of God, this Miniſter cannot rationally deny but whatever is contained in it is true. He muſt therefore (whatever his Reaſon dictates to the contrary) confeſs, that the old Philoſophical Principle, *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, is falſe, as well as the other, *Quæ conveniunt in uno tertio conveniunt inter ſe*; as alſo, he muſt grant that our ſenſes may be miſtaken, or daſh out of the Bible the apparition of Angels to *Abraham*, *Jacob*, &c. Nor is it neceſſary that God give us other Faculties before he reveal theſe Truths, becauſe my Reaſon tells me God can do things above my capacity; and therefore, ſeeing I cannot doubt of the Revelation, I muſt conclude in theſe circumſtances, my Senſe and Reaſon are deceived. Shew me a more efficacious way to reduce an Infidel, if you can.

Now, *Sir*, I have made my firſt promiſe good, and what I add is *ex abundanti*.

You tell us, *Papiſts can never prove Tranſubſtantiation, till they firſt prove themſelves infallible in interpreting Scriptures.* Seeing, *Sir*, you are confident with me, I will take the boldneſs to uſe the ſame freedom; and therefore I tell you, till you can prove the Church of *England* is *infallible* in interpreting Scripture, I will never believe they cannot; for, *Sir*, I am not ſo devoted to ſenſe and prejudice, as quite to neglect my Reaſon. Seeing therefore the Papiſts challenge both Scriptures, Fathers, and General Councils, for the ſupport of their Doctrin, and ſhrewd Arguments too (upon my word) to demonſtrate their Churches Infallibility; why ſhall I brand them with *Idolatry*, *Superſtition*, &c. at the inſtigation of a Church which tells me, *Sir*, I may be miſtaken? But after all; you will not believe that God hath revealed this Myſtery; but why? becauſe it is impoſſible he ſhould. May not an Infidel on the ſame grounds deny the very firſt verſe of the Bible, *In the beginning God created Heaven and Earth?* If he ſhould tell you, God hath not revealed this Truth, becauſe 'tis impoſſible he ſhould; what would you anſwer but this? Friend, you are an impertinent Fellow. But let us examin your Reaſons; the firſt is, Becauſe our ſenſes tell us 'tis Bread, This

is

is answered already; so I go to the second, drawn from our reason, which tells us, That one and the same Body cannot be in several places. *First*, this Argument falls as heavy on your elder Brethren the *Lutherans* of *Germany*; nay, and on Bishop *Andrews*, *Taylor*, *Casaubon*, &c. (who held the *Real Presence*) as on *Papists*; so that methinks a *Church-of-England-man* should never hector against *Papists* with such an Argument, which equally presseth his Brethren in Christ the Protestants: but experience teaches us, that passion is a blind Monster, which makes no distinction between Friends and Foes; it tramples on those, that it may sacrifice these to its fury. *Secondly*, Sir, let me ask you upon what Principle your Reason founds the impossibility of the same thing's being in several places? Is it upon this, that *a thing cannot be here, and not here, at the same time?* Good Sir, shew me by what Logic *to be here and there*, is the same as *to be here and not here?* But this is not all; you have another retrenchment still, *viz.* it cannot be that the *whole Body of a man be crowded into the compass of a pins head.* This you affirm; but I see no reason, only an *ipse dixit*, which will never pass for a Demonstration with me. But if your Doctrin be true, how came our Savior into the Chamber when the doors were shut? This question has put some of your Gentlemen to a *non-plus*, who at length choose rather to speak *Nonsense*, than *nothing at all.* Some say then he came in at the Window, others at the Chimney, another at the Key-hole: but above all, commend me to a Learned Doctor, who being asked how it was possible for Christ to enter into the Room, the doors lock'd, unless his Body were contracted, gave this (I will not say foolish, but) impious Answer, and, as I am told, under his hand, *You know to what perfection our Picklocks are come, we must give a little more dexterity to our Savior.* Had a *Jew* or a *Turk* (dear Reader) vomited out such a blasphemous comparison, I should rather have *pitied his ignorance*, than *blamed his malice*; but for a man who professeth Christianity, who preacheth the Gospel, thus to prophane it, is insupportable.

Sir, if you know this Gentleman (as probably you may;) teach him better manners, than thus to turn his Raileries on his Savior; bring him to his wits, if his frenzy be not past cure, and perswade him from explicating more Scripture, if he cannot do it without a crime. As for my Conclusion, *Sir*, it threatens the Doctor with

no

no punishment *here*, I assure you, but in the *world to come*; and I fear he is resolved to try the truth of it, out of a meer punctilio. So, *Sir*, I leave you, only desiring you to tell me the meaning of these words, *All the danger we fear for opposing that Church (in this way of Disputation) is wholly in this world.* If I understand it rightly, 'tis a reflecting Proposition, and seems to squint on a Person whom your Duty obliges you to reverence. But if your apprehension comes from your Fellow-Subjects the Papists, you may sleep securely, and never fear *to rise in the morning with your throat cut*. *Sir*, Farewell.

Yours, W. D.

LONDON:

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty for His Household and Chappel; and are to be sold at his Printing-house on the Ditch-side in *Black-Fryars*. 1687.

272816